THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.S.NARAYANA

Writ Petition No.16411 of 2007

Date: 13th September, 2007

Between :-

Smt. J.Chandrakala ..

Petitioner

And

The Revenue Divisional Officer,
East Division, R.R. District
At Malakunta Road, Goshamahal,
Hyderabad ..
Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.S.NARAYANA

Writ Petition No.16411 of 2007

ORDER:-

Heard Sri Bollam Lingaiah Yadav and also the A.G.P. for Civil Supplies.

2. The Writ Petition is filed for a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent in calling for applications for the post of Fair Price Shop Dealership at Kuntloor village, Hayathnagar Mandal of Ranga Reddy District vide his publication No.2983/2007 dt. 0-7-2007 is illegal, arbitrary and violative orders of the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District and opposed the provisions of Article 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently to stay all proceedings of the respondent publication No.2983/2007, and pass such other suitable orders.

3. It is stated that the Enforcement Officer inspected the shop of the petitioner in her absence and conducted a panchanama and on the basis of the inspection report, the respondent suspended the authorization of the petitioner under Control Order 1973 on 4-12-2004, through his proceedings No.C/304/2004. It is stated by the petitioner that against the said orders, she preferred

Appeal before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District vide case No.Ex.A.7/639/2004 and the Joint Collector, Rangareddy District set aside the orders of the respondent in proceedings No.C/304/2004 dt.4-12-2004 and remanded the matter with a direction to the respondent to issue fresh show cause notice and after giving opportunity to the petitioner, pass appropriate orders under A.P.S.Public Distribution Control Order 2001. Pending the same, the respondent had issued the notification. The same is questioned.

4. This Court had decided the similar question in W.P.No.16454/2007 and dismissed the Writ Petition. In the light of the same, this Writ Petition also is hereby dismissed. However, this would not come in the way of the respondent from disposing of the proceedings, if any, pending before the respondent. It is also needless to say that the respondent is at liberty to complete and dispose of the proceedings at an early date. No costs.

_____

Justice P.S.Narayana

13th September, 2007

smr